

PTOL-413A (06-09)
 Approved for use through 07/31/2009. OMB 0651-0031
 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/512,052-Conf. #8419 First Named Applicant: Toru UEDA
 Examiner: B. J. Rustemeyer Art Unit: 2426 Status of Application: Published

Tentative Participants:

(1) Brett Rustemeyer (2) Robert Downs #48,222
 (3) _____ (4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: July 8, 2009 Proposed Time: 11:00 (AM/PM)

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☐ Telephonic (2) ☒ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☒ NO

If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>101</u>	<u>1,27,28</u>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) <u>102</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Chatfield</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

☒ Continuation Sheet Attached

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

NOTE:

This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP §713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

 Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

 Examiner/SPE Signature

Robert Downs

 Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

48,222

 Registration Number, if applicable

Agenda

- § 101 – program, *per se*
- Summarize Present Invention (Fig. 12; pp. 74-86)
- Summarize Chatfield (Fig. 2A; paras. 0040, 0041)
- Office Action arguments based on Chatfield

The Office Action alleges that the claimed selection order management table is taught by the database structure of Fig. 6 (Office Action at page 6, last paragraph beginning “wherein, the content providing station...”).

Claim 1 recites “a plurality of content providing stations,” that a selection rule is stored for selecting from among the content providing stations, and that the content providing station that receives a switching instruction stores a selection order management table.

- Differences over Chatfield

In the claimed invention, the content selection requesting station stores a selection rule for selecting from among the content providing stations, and the selection order management table is distributed over a plurality of content providing stations. Content or content providing devices are switched in an order specified in the selection order management table.

In Chatfield, the database of services and service providers is contained in a data center, located between the end users and the service providers (see 201 in Fig. 2A).

Chatfield discloses that a next alternative service provider is searched in the case where the preferred service provider is not available or cannot provide a requested service.

Therefore, Applicants submit that the distributed selection order management table and “order” provided by the selection order management table are not taught or suggested by the teachings in Chatfield.

A further difference between the present invention and Chatfield is that in the present invention the operator is provided with a single button for switching to the next content providing device. The present invention facilitates switching between content providing devices in an order defined based on the network.

A proposed amendment is provided for claim 1 that clarifies this aspect.